

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 07-3902

REESA ADAMS,

Appellant

v.

JO ANNE B. BARNHART,
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civil No. 06-cv-01427)
District Judge: The Honorable Donetta W. Ambrose

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
May 23, 2008

Before: SMITH, HARDIMAN, and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges.

(Filed: May 29, 2008)

OPINION OF THE COURT

NYGAARD, Circuit Judge.

Reesa Adams appeals from the decision of the District Court affirming the Commissioner's denial of her claim for disability insurance benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act. 42 U.S.C. §§ 401-433. Because our opinion is wholly without precedential value, and because the parties and the District Court are familiar with its operative facts, we offer only an abbreviated recitation to explain why we will affirm the decision of the District Court.

Adams did not dispute the ALJ's findings, adopted by the Commissioner, with regard to her physical impairments. Rather, she argued that the ALJ erred in denying her claim of mental impairment. We agree with the District Court that the decision adopted by the Commissioner is supported by substantial evidence.

In the decision adopted by the Commissioner, it was recognized that Adams had a mental impairment. Nonetheless, upon engaging the required sequential evaluation of the evidence (20 C.F.R. §404.1520), it was determined that Adams' impairment did not limit her basic activities or work, and only slightly limited her in social function, concentration, and persistent activity. *See Petition of Sullivan*, 904 F.2d 826, 845 (3d Cir. 1990).

Additionally, it was noted that Adams did not suffer any episodes of prolonged decompensation related to her mental condition. These factual findings reasonably supported the overall conclusion that Adams' mental impairments did not significantly limit her ability to perform basic work activities over a twelve-month period, and that her

impairment was therefore not “severe,” as would be necessary to support a disability claim. *See Newell v. Comm’r of Social Security*, 347 F.3d 541 (3d Cir. 2003).

For all of these reasons, we will affirm the decision of the District Court.